

Serial No. 10/506,711

PF020012

**Remarks**

In view of the above amendments to the claims and the following discussion, the applicants submit that the claims now pending in the application are not obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form.

**REJECTIONS**

A. 35 U. S. C. § 103

1. Claims 1 and 3-5 are not obvious over Dossot et al.

Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dossot et al. (U. S. Patent 5,592,045 issued on January 7, 1997). The applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by this reference.

Claim 1 is directed to an electron beam deflection system for a cathode-ray tube (see, specification at page 1, lines 4-5). The deflection system includes a pair of horizontal deflection coils 2 and a pair of vertical deflection coils 3 (see, FIG. 1 and the specification at page 2, lines 24-26). The two pairs of coils are electrically insulated from each other by a separator 4 (see, FIG. 1 and the specification at page 2, lines 26-27). At least one pair of the auxiliary coils 10 is made on a flexible sheet 13 that is placed around the neck of the tube (see, FIG. 2 and the specification at page 3, line 1). The auxiliary coils 10 modify the magnetic field created by at least one of the two pairs of deflection coils (see, the specification at page 3, lines 1-3). The flexible sheet 13 is wound around a cylindrical rigid plastic support 9 (see, the specification at FIG. 2). The rigid plastic support 9 has regions with a low relative permittivity 32 (see, the specification at page 3, lines 20-21).

Serial No. 10/506,711

PF020012

Dossot et al. discloses a deflection yoke for a CRT (see, Dossot et al. at column 1, lines 4-5). The deflection yoke includes auxiliary coils 20, 21 made on flexible support 27 (see, Dossot et al. at FIG. 4 and column 2, lines 55-57).

The Examiner indicates that support 27 includes regions 25 with a low relative permittivity (see, Dossot et al. at FIG. 4). However, Dossot et al. describes regions 22-25 as holes formed in support 27 through which studs 12-15 are inserted to position support 27 along the Z-axis (see, Dossot et al. at column 2, lines 58-61). Dossot et al. does not describe or suggest that holes 22-25 have any effect on permittivity of the support or any effect on sensitivity of the electron beams to the feed created by the auxiliary coils, which is one of the purposes of the invention recited in claim 1. In Dossot et al., holes 22-25 are only and clearly dedicated to make an easy positioning of the flexible support around the tube neck.

Dossot et al. does not describe or suggest an electron beam deflection system including a pair of horizontal deflection coils and a pair of vertical deflection coils electrically insulated from each other by a separator and at least one pair of the auxiliary coils made on a flexible sheet that is placed around the neck of the tube, where the auxiliary coils modify the magnetic field created by at least one of the two pairs of deflection coils, wherein the flexible sheet is wound around a cylindrical rigid plastic support having regions with a low relative permittivity. Rather, Dossot et al. only discloses a deflection yoke including auxiliary coils made on flexible support. Since Dossot et al. does not describe or suggest an electron beam deflection system including a pair of horizontal deflection coils and a pair of vertical deflection coils electrically insulated from each other by a separator and at least one pair of the auxiliary coils made on a flexible sheet that is placed around the neck of the tube, where the auxiliary coils modify the magnetic field created by at least one of the two pairs of deflection coils, wherein the flexible sheet is wound around a cylindrical rigid plastic support having regions with a low relative permittivity, claim 1 is patentable over Dossot et al.

Serial No. 10/506,711

PF020012


Claims 3-5 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 1. For the same reasons as stated above, claim 3-5 are also patentable over Dossot et al. Additionally, new claims 7-8, also dependent upon claim 1, are patentable over Dossot et al. for the same reasons.

### CONCLUSION

The applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form and this application is presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring continuation of the adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Ms. Patricia A. Verlangieri, at (609) 734-6867, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney  
Reg. No. 42,201  
(609) 734-6867

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC.  
P. O. Box 1450  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

January 8, 2008